REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 22-25 are canceled, and claims 32-33 are added. Claims 6-8, 14-21, and 26-31 remain in this application as amended herein. Accordingly, claims 6-8, 14-21, and 26-33 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 6, 17 and 20 have been amended to place the application in condition for allowance by copying the limitations previously called for in claim 13 into claims 6 and 17 and by copying the limitations previously called for in claim 25 into 20, claim 19 has been amended to correct a minor error, and claims 32-33 have been added in place of the cancelled claims. It is therefore submitted that this Amendment should be entered.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected 6-8, 13-18, 20-21, and 25-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami (U.S. Patent No. 4,598,243) in view of Patino (U.S. Patent No. 5,684,587) and further in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,169). Claims 13 and 25 are cancelled. Applicants submit that the remaining claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

The Kawakami patent shows, in Fig. 1, a power supply that compares a voltage E_S, which is related to the output voltage E of a battery, to a reference voltage E_r. The value of the reference voltage E_r is determined by the shape of the battery package, which is determined by the type of battery used. The shape of the battery *controls the position of a switch* 30. When the switch is connected to the upper contact point, the value of the reference voltage E_r it is the voltage at tap 26, and when the switch is connected to the lower contact point, the value of the reference voltage E_r is the voltage at

the tap 28. (See also Col. 3, lns. 1-45). Therefore, *the reference voltage is selected* from one of two possible values. Kawakami does not disclose or suggest *correcting the reference voltage*, and Kawakami does not disclose or suggest that the reference voltage is corrected *by subtracting a reference value* from the reference voltage.

The Patino patent describes a cutoff voltage V_{co} that is compared to an actual battery voltage to determine *whether to terminate rapid charging of the battery*. A steady state voltage V_{ss} is determined by multiplying the steady state voltage per cell by the total number of battery cells N, and an adjustment voltage V^+ is determined by multiplying *the relative impedance* Z_X by *the rated charge current* I^X for that battery. Then, the adjusted cutoff voltage V_{co} is determined by subtracting the adjustment voltage V^+ from the steady state voltage V_{ss}. (See Fig. 2; and Col. 2, lns. 29-67). Though Patino describes determining the number of battery cells, the number is used to determine the steady state voltage V_{ss}, namely, *the value that is subsequently adjusted*, rather than *a correction value*. Moreover, the actual correction value, namely, the cutoff adjustment voltage V^+, is *not determined from the number of battery cells*. Additionally, the resulting adjusted cutoff voltage V_{co} determines the battery voltage *at which rapid charging terminates*, rather than *a low power warning value*. Patino neither discloses nor suggests correcting *a low power warning value*, and Patino neither discloses nor suggests that such a value is corrected by subtracting a correction value *from a low power warning voltage*.

The Lee patent describes determining a battery residual capacity and then correcting the residual capacity data according to variations in the environmental factors of a battery, namely, the variations of battery temperature, amount of battery of self-discharge, and amount of battery discharge.

(See Fig. 7; and Col. 7, lns. 10-44). Though the patent describes adding corrections to a value, the corrections are *based on temperature and discharge* rather than a number of cells in a battery. Moreover, the *residual capacity data* is corrected rather than *a low power warning voltage value*. Lee does not disclose or suggest correcting *a low power warning voltage value*, and Lee does not disclose or suggest that such a value is corrected by subtracting a correction value from *the low power warning voltage value*.

Therefore, neither Kawakami, Patino, nor Lee discloses or suggest:

> correcting means for correcting a low power warning voltage value by subtracting the correction value from the low power warning voltage value

as recited in claim 6.

It follows that neither Kawakami, Patino, nor Lee, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the video camera defined in claim 6. Claim 6 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Claims 7-8, 14-16, and 29 depend from claim 6, and therefore each is distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 17 defines a video system that includes a video camera body having limitations similar to those of the video camera set out in claim 6. It follows that claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over Kawakami, Patino and Lee for at least the same reasons.

Claims 18-19 and 30 depend from claim 17. For at least the same reasons, claims 18-19 and 30 are distinguishable over the cited art.

Independent claim 20 recites a method having steps similar to those carried out by the means elements defined in claim 6. Claim 20 is therefore patentably distinguishable over

Kawakami, Patino and Lee for at least the same reasons.

Claims 21, 26-28 and 31 depend from claim 20 and, for at least the same reasons, are distinguishable over the cited art.

Claims 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawakami in view of Patino and further in view of Lee and in further view of the "Smart Battery Data Specification".

Claim 19 depends from claim 17 and is therefore distinguishable over Kawakami, Patino and Lee for at least the same reasons.

The "Smart Battery Data Specification" describes a system host that obtains factual information from a smart battery or obtains predictive data that the smart battery calculates from the factual information. The publication therefore does not address the deficiencies of Kawakami, Patino and Lee.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

New claims 32-33 include limitations set out in, *e.g.*, claims 17-18 and 30. Therefore, claims 32-33 are distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Support for new claims 32-33 is found, *e.g.*, in Figs. 3-5 and in Pages 5-10 of the specification.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner

might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefore.

Dated: February 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

626933_1.DOC